

First change I D (Definitions) Is there a real problem here that requires a rule change?? A contracting company certainly seems adequate to include individuals. The fact that the original writer forgot about this, does not necessarily mean that we have to go thru this lengthy change. Has there been a problem arise here or is this just a mental exercise?

III D Is is just about the same as the definition. Does the fact that covered employees did not include the word "contract", mean we should go for a change?? Is there any real problem or do we have some people thinking about possible problems?

IV B 4 Is it really necessary to add that NO OTHER FORM IS ACCEPTABLE?? Any one who has experience with any agency of the Federal Government KNOWS that you must use the correct form.

VII Both options submitted do not appear to add anything materially to the process, unless I missed it during the reading.

I think that the team headed by Mr. Jon L Jordon or (whoever wrote this) has entirely too much time on his hands and is costing taxpayers too much money for their salary.